

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/616,247	07/09/2003	Philip S. Kim	DRPK-0003	9491	
23377	7590 03/23/2006		EXAM	· EXAMINER	
WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP			STIGELL, THEODORE J		
ONE LIBERTY PLACE, 46TH FLOOR 1650 MARKET STREET		R	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
PHILADELP	HIA, PA 19103		3763		

DATE MAILED: 03/23/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		E)
	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/616,247	KIM, PHILIP S.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Theodore J. Stigell	3763
The MAILING DATE of this communication app		correspondence address
Period for Reply		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from e, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. mely filed n the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>07 F</u>	ehruary 2006	
	s action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa		osecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under the	•	
Disposition of Claims		
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-31</u> is/are pending in the application	ı.	
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra		
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.		
6)⊠ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are rejected.		
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	•	
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirement.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.	
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acc	epted or b) objected to by the	Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	tion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	ejected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	xaminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:	n priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority document	ts have been received.	
2. Certified copies of the priority document		ion No
Copies of the certified copies of the prior	rity documents have been receive	ed in this National Stage
application from the International Burea		
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not receive	∍d.
	·	
Attachment(s)		· (OTO, 440)
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D	
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	5) 🔲 Notice of Informal F	Patent Application (PTO-152)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>8/21/2003</u> .	6)	

Art Unit: 3763

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

In response to the Applicant's traversal filed on February 7, 2006, the Examiner agrees with the Applicant and has withdrawn the Restriction Requirement. Claims 1-31 were examined on the merits in this Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 22 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Xavier (5,458,631). Xavier discloses an implantable catheter and pump used for long term pain management comprising a surgically implanted catheter (12) having a discharge portion (30) that is capable of lying in a neural structure peripheral to a central nervous system and an implantable pump (32) and reservoir (38) located in a subcutaneous tissue, wherein a proximal end of the catheter, and the reservoir, are in fluid communication with the pump and the pump is operated to deliver a predetermined dosage of medication through the discharge portion into the peripheral neural structure, thereby alleviating pain and providing pain management and wherein the catheter has an embedded and electrically conductive material (14) throughout the catheter length sufficient to enable electrical conduction, the material facilitating stimulation to verify a catheter distal end location adjacent to the neural structure.

Art Unit: 3763

Claims 28 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Galindo (4,411,657). Galindo discloses a surgical needle for use in inserting a catheter comprising an electrically conductive shaft (14) having a first end (16) adapted to enter a facial sheath of a neural structure, a second end, wherein the shaft has an interior channel running longitudinally there through, and an electrically conductive protrusion (30) extending from the shaft to create a corner there between, the protrusion facilitating connection to a clip located at the distal end of a nerve stimulator.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 23-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Xavier (5,458,631). Xavier discloses the invention as substantially claimed. Xavier does not disclose the specific medication or the amount of medication to administer to the patient. However, these parameters are deemed matters of design choice, well

Application/Control Number: 10/616,247 Page 4

Art Unit: 3763

within the skill of the ordinary artisan, obtained through routine experimentation in determining the results.

Claims 1-21 and 30-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Klein et al. (Anesth Analg 2000; 91:1473-1478) in view of Xavier (5,458,631). Klein et al. disclose a method of providing long term pain management that includes most of the limitations as recited in claims 1-21 and 30-31, including surgically implanting a catheter to create an infusion site, wherein a discharge portion of the catheter lies in a peripheral neural structure, attaching a pump to the catheter and operating the pump to deliver a predetermined dosage of medication through the discharge portion of the catheter into the infusion site. However, Klein et al. teach to use a disposable infusion pump to deliver the drugs instead of an implantable infusion pump.

Xavier discloses an implantable catheter and pump that provides long term pain management by infusing drugs into the epidural space of the patient. Xavier teaches to use a permanently implantable pump to reduce damage to the patient's skin and to reduce the risk of infection.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method of Klein et al. with the implantable pump of Xavier to make a method that was less prone to cause damage or infection to the patient.

Conclusion

Application/Control Number: 10/616,247

Art Unit: 3763

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Theodore J. Stigell whose telephone number is 571-272-8759. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

Page 5

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nicholas Lucchesi can be reached on 571-272-4977. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Theodore J. Stigell

الماديد المادي